

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

1.956
Su3Su33

SUGAR REPORTS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

WASHINGTON, D. C.

DECEMBER 1962

NO. 128

CONTENTS

PAGES

1.	MARKET REVIEW	2 - 4
2.	SIXTY YEARS IN SUGAR	5 - 28
3.	(a) ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO SUGAR SUPPLIES: For 1962 and For 1963	29 - 34
	(b) OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS	35
4.	STATISTICAL SERIES	36 - 52
	(a) Highlights	36
	(b) Supply and Disposition Summary: January-October 1962	37
	(c) Disposition and stocks: January-October 1962 and 1961	38
	To end November 1962 and 1961	38
	(d) Mainland Production and Quota Charges: January-October 1962 and 1961	39
	(e) Refiners and Importers receipts by Source of Supply: January-October 1962 and 1961	39
	(f) Status of Quota and Balance as of November 30 and December 17, 1962	40 - 43
	(g) Deliveries by States: October 1962	44
	to end October 1962 and 1961	45 - 46
	(h) Deliveries by type of product or business of buyer, third quarter 1962, with comparisons: (1) Sugar	47 - 49
	(2) Dextrose	50
	(i) Sugar Prices by Areas	51
	(j) Refined sugar production and stocks	52

MARKET REVIEW

Deliveries of refined sugar during December were stimulated by a 0.10 cent per pound increase in the wholesale price of refined sugar announced on December 7 - 10 to become effective December 23, the end of the cooling off period for the longshoremen's strike at East and Gulf ports. The price increase apparently affected all territories except the far west and to both cane and beet sugar.

Through December 15, 1962 deliveries for U.S. consumption totaled 9,269,000 tons or 84,000 tons more than for the same period last year. Deliveries in 1961 after December 15, amounted to 426,000 tons. If all factors, including the price move induce a 10 percent increase in deliveries for the remainder of 1962, total deliveries for the year would be about 9,750,000 tons, approximately 140,000 tons higher than those for 1961. Such deliveries would be smaller than prospective 1962 quota charges by just about the amount of refining and other losses, leaving stocks of quota sugar in hands of refiners and importers about unchanged from the year earlier. Per capita consumption at an average rate would account for disappearances of sugar in 1962 in the 9,625,000 to 9,650,000 tons range. Physical deliveries in excess of that range would indicate a second successive increase in stocks held by sugar users, as sugar and in finished goods.

From December 1 to 13, 1962 the spot price for domestic raw cane sugar at New York, duty paid, rose from 6.50 cents to 6.55 cents per pound and has averaged 6.52 cents during December 1-19. The average price from January 1 through December 19, 1962 was 6.44 cents. Continuation of the 6.55 cent price for the remaining market days would make the average 6.45 cents for the calendar year 1962, up 0.15 cent from the 1961 and 1960 averages. The average wholesale price for refined cane sugar in the Northeast territory during 1962 will be 9.60 cents per pound, up 0.20 cents from that of 1961 and 0.17 cent from the 1960 calendar year average.

The Department's Crop Report of December 1962 indicates sugar production from the 1962 mainland sugar crop at 960,000 tons. Of this

total, 460,000 tons would be produced in Louisiana and 500,000 tons in Florida. The estimate did not take into account the effects of the mid-December freeze. By that time most of the Louisiana sugarcane had been harvested but damage is likely to be much more severe in Florida. Marketings from the current mainland cane crop to be made in 1963 will be greater than a year earlier unless the freeze damage is very severe indeed. The estimate exceeds the amount of 1962 quota available for new crop marketing by 427,000 tons. Such a volume of mainland cane sugar marketings in early 1963 would leave a balance in the initial 1963 quota of less than 500,000 tons.

Sugar production from the 1962 domestic beet sugar crop was estimated in the December Crop Report at 2,585,000 short tons. Such production would provide this area with an "Old Crop" supply for marketing in 1963 larger by 185,000 tons than a year earlier. In combination with the 1963 quota, such an effective inventory would permit uncommonly large marketings in both the "old crop" and "new crop" marketing periods. Some 2,000,000 tons would be available for January-September, about the same as the previous high in 1961 and, if that were accomplished, marketing of 700,000 tons would be permitted for October-December, about 10 percent more than the previous high in 1959.

The spot price for world market sugar, as quoted by the New York Coffee and Sugar Exchange, continued its steep rise. It was quoted at 3.70 cents per pound on November 20 and at 4.30 cents on December 19. The world market price is thus at a five-year high as the year 1962 draws to a close. Less than eleven months ago, on January 29 and 30, the price stood at 2.05 cents, a twenty-one year low point.

In November the Foreign Agricultural Service estimated 1962-63 centrifugal sugar production for the world exclusive of Communist China at 55.9 million short tons, raw value. In December, F.O. Licht released an estimate which amounts to 56.5 million tons when converted to a comparable basis. The one percent difference between the two estimates is the net result of differences in many individual country estimates. Substantial differences in Brazilian and Indian figures appear to be based on different conversion techniques - FAS conversion recognizes that the sugar output data are mostly for white sugar.

After the mid-November announcement of a USSR crop of 49 million metric tons of sugar beets for sugar, Licht reduced its Soviet sugar

production estimate from substantially higher to slightly lower than the FAS estimate.

While FAS and Licht agree in their estimate of the Cuban crop - 4.2 million metric tons - the Cubans on November 25 broadcast a 4.8 million ton estimate, the same as the tonnage produced in 1962.

The parties to the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement agreed on a negotiated price for 1963 equivalent to 5.755 U.S. cents per pound, a 0.83 percent increase over the 1962 price. This price, minus a variable roll-back for prewar freight and insurance will be paid for 1,490,093 long tons.

SIXTY YEARS IN SUGAR

by

C. R. OviattForeword

For some time past, Messrs. Myers, Murphy and Homstad have urged me to put together some notes on my accumulated information and experiences in sugar, particularly those dealing with the history of the beet sugar industry in Michigan and adjoining States, which for this purposes I may term the Great Lakes area.

Because I have been on the fringe of sugar operations more often than in the center, I was reluctant to accept the undertaking. Their repeated urgings, however, and the thought that I might be able to develop some helpful comments on events and conditions that have affected the beet sugar industry during my lifetime and which might not be too repetitious of the work of more effective historians, have prompted me to set forth these notes.

So that the reader may better understand and appraise my comments, I will begin by explaining my own connections with the sugar industry. This will be followed by Part I, which will relate primarily to the history of the industry in the Great Lakes Area. Part II will deal with my general experiences in sugar, including a few points regarding which I believe some emphasis is warranted.

Opportunities to Observe and Participate

I was born during 1892 on a farm in a good soil area about 14 miles northwest of Bay City, Michigan. My father had become interested in sugar beets, largely through the efforts of Dr. Robert Kedzie of Michigan Agricultural College (now Michigan State University, hereinafter referred to as "MSU"). In the early 1890's, Dr. Kedzie obtained a considerable quantity of beet seed from Germany for distribution to farmers in Michigan, who grew hundreds of test plots around the State.

My father began growing the crop commercially about 1898 and continued to grow a relatively small acreage until he sold that farm in 1905. The beets were hauled to railway points about 6 miles from the farm and shipped to factories in Bay City. Since special help was not employed for producing the beets on our farm, I helped tend the crop as a youngster right from the start.

In 1905 my father bought a farm nearer Bay City. It was within a range of 5 to 7 miles from the three beet sugar factories then operating in the city. It may be noteworthy that the former owner of this farm had lost 40 acres of beets in one year, by freezing, while he attempted to develop a mechanical harvester.

For the next ten years, most of our beets were delivered by wagon to the factory of the West Bay City Sugar Company, which was the nearest and most accessible by roads. However, subsequent to certain road improvements, our crop was marketed regularly to the factory in the southwest part of the city, now operated by the Monitor Sugar Company. Thus, for nearly 50 years, about one-third of the farm acreage has been producing beets annually for this factory.

I purchased the home farm from my parents in 1919 and operated it until 1945, when I sold it to the man who had worked many years for me on a profit-sharing plan. For the first 8 years of my own operations, before I began work with MSU, I produced certified seeds, particularly beans, barley, and oats, in addition to the main crop of sugar beets. The work with certified seed crops placed me in close connection with the Farm Crops Department of MSU. I graduated from MSU with the class of 1916. With these connections and with a favorable record of sugar beet production, I was selected in 1927 as the first Farm Crops Extension Specialist employed by MSU to work primarily on sugar beets. While part of my time was devoted to work on beans and alfalfa, my main responsibilities related to activities designed to enhance the beet sugar industry of the State.

The "big depression" which followed the stock market crash in 1929 represented a rough set-back for the beet sugar industry, and so in the early 1930's my efforts to aid the industry took the form of reestablishing the industry in Washington, encouraging cooperation between growers and processors, establishing local sugar beet growers association, and the development of a new type of contract to meet the changed circumstances. Subsequently, I represented the growers of the area in the development of the Sugar Stabilization Agreement and special legislation.

It might be interesting to note that for the period of the depression the sugar beet crop was the sole crop which kept my farming operations on a solvent basis, permitting me to meet tax and interest obligations regularly. My farm records show that for that period my average net return per acre of sugar beets exceeded the gross return per acre from any of my other crops.

During the early years of operation of the Farmers and Manufacturers Beet Sugar Association, I was a grower member of the board of directors and the grower representative on the three-member executive committee.

When the Jones-Costigan Amendment became operative for the 1934-crop season, I switched employment from MSU to the Department, although my headquarters remained in the field until 1942. For a number of years, I continued to use my former office at MSU, which was shared with the men assigned by the Sugar Plant Office at Beltsville to operate their East Lansing Station.

During the early years of my field work under the sugar program, I handled program operations in the so-called "Eastern Area", which extended as far west as Colorado. Harry Simpson (later the labor man in the Sugar Division) supervised operations in the Mountain States Area and Carl Lowe covered the Pacific Area.

There was a lapse in the sugar program between the end of the 1935-crop season and September of 1937, because of the Supreme Court action against processing taxes. For a period of about a year I worked as an agriculturist for the Great Lakes Sugar Company, with headquarters in Toledo, Ohio. When the Sugar Act of 1937 became effective, I resumed employment with the Department, with headquarters in the Michigan ASC State office in Lansing.

In 1942, I was requested to move to Washington. During World War II, I handled a considerable part of the beet and cane payment program work. With the reorganization of sugar operations following the war period, the Conditional Payments Branch was formed and since then my activities have related principally to Secretarial determinations.

PART I - SUGAR BEETS IN THE GREAT LAKES AREA

Much good material has been published on the industry of this area, particularly by Dan Gutleben, whose "Sugar Tramp" series represents an amazing amount of detail encompassing not only general historical matters but including a wealth of comments on the artisans who built and operated the beet sugar factories of the United States. Libraries contain a great deal of information on sugar, and I understand that the Library of Franklin Institute at Philadelphia has an especially large volume of this material. (I understand that Gutleben has helped revise and compile it.) Accordingly, the following notes are intended merely to amplify the record on certain points.

Perhaps the record for the area could be viewed in better perspective if we start with some general data on factories of the United States.

Groupings of Beet Sugar Factories of the United States

<u>Group No.</u>	<u>Group Characterization</u>	<u>Years</u>	<u>Number of factories</u> ^{1/}	
			<u>Erected</u>	<u>Remaining</u>
1	Early trials	1838-1879	14	0
2	Better attempts	1880-1897	12	3
3	Building craze	1898-1906	67	23
4	Early century	1907-1915	20	5
5	War period	1916-1919	28	12
6	Between wars	1920-1941	23	14
7	Moderns	1942-1962	<u>6</u>	<u>6</u>
Totals			170	63

1/Counting Mendota (the factory of the Spreckels Sugar Company to begin operations in California during 1963), but not Green Bay, which discontinued beet operations with 1962 although still refining cane sugar.

Chronology of Beet Sugar Factories of Great Lakes Area

1838-40 White Pigeon, Mich.	1902-Carrollton (Saginaw) Mich.
1866-70 Fon du Lac, Wisc.	1902-Croswell, Mich.
1866-71 Chatsworth, Ill.	1902- Sebawaing, Mich.
1870-75 Black Hawk, Wisc.	1903-06 East Tawas, Mich.
1871-72 Freeport, Ill.	1903-55 Menominee, Mich.
1887-1932 Menomonee Falls, Wisc.	1903-48 Owosso, Mich.
1898-1907 Bay City (Essexville), Mich.	1903-55 St. Louis, Mich.
1899-1900 Pekin, Ill.	1904-34 Chippewa Falls, Wisc.
1899-1959 Alma, Mich.	1904-41 Janesville, Wisc.
1899-1941 Bay City (Essexville), Mich.	1905-27 Riverdale, Ill.
1899-1902 Benton Harbor, Mich.	1905-57 Blissfield, Mich.
1899- Caro, Mich.	1905-24 Madison, Wisc.
1899-1952 Holland, Mich.	1906-12 Charlevoix, Mich.
1899-1904 Kalamazoo, Mich.	1910-52 Paulding, Ohio <u>1/</u>
1899-1905 Rochester, Mich.	1911 - Findlay, Ohio
1899-1943 Bay City (West), Mich.	1912-44 Decatur, Ind.
1900-28 Marine City, Mich.	1912- Ottawa Ohio
1900- Fremont, Ohio	1912-41 Toledo, Ohio
1901-Bay City (Salzburg), Mich.	1920-51 Mt. Pleasant, Mich.
1901-53 Lansing, Mich.	1920-62 Green Bay, Wisc. <u>2/</u>
1901-05 Saginaw, Mich.	

1/ Still standing, but partly stripped of machinery.

2/ Presently refining some cane sugar.

Groupings of Beet Sugar Factories of the Great Lakes Area

<u>Group No.</u>	<u>Chief Problem</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent of total</u>
1	Early trials	7	17
2	Unsuitable land	15	36
3	Lack or change in farmer interest	12	28
	Survivors	<u>8</u>	<u>19</u>
	Total	42	100

Details on Beet Sugar Factories of the Great Lakes Area 1/

Group 1. White Pigeon, Michigan; Fond du Lac, Wisconsin; Chatsworth, Illinois; Black Hawk, Wisconsin; Freeport, Illinois; Bay City, Michigan (original) and Pekin, Illinois.

Group 2. Benton Harbor, Michigan; Holland, Michigan; Kalamazoo, Michigan; Rochester, Michigan; Marine City, Michigan; Lansing, Michigan; Mt. Clemens, Michigan; East Tawas, Michigan; Menominee, Michigan; Chippewa Falls, Wisconsin; Janesville, Wisconsin; Madison, Wisconsin; Charlevoix, Michigan; Paulding, Ohio; and Mt. Pleasant, Michigan.

Group 3. Menomonee Falls, Wisconsin; Alma, Michigan; Bay City (Essexville) Michigan; West Bay City, Michigan; Saginaw, Michigan; St. Louis, Michigan; Owosso, Michigan; Blissfield, Michigan; Riverdale, Illinois; Decatur, Indiana; Toledo, Ohio; and Green Bay, Wisconsin.

1/ The factories in each group are listed in order of erection. The groupings are somewhat arbitrary, principally because of overlapping problems and deficiencies of personal information on conditions in certain districts of Illinois and Wisconsin.

Brevity of Existence

A total of 12 factories in the area had individual periods of existence of 10 years or less. The big majority of the 12 did not last more than 5 years and the operating seasons were much fewer. Excluding the early trials, the poorest operating record was set at East Tawas, where only 17,648 tons of beets were processed before the project was abandoned.

Logging Off the Timber

Much of Michigan, particularly the northern half of the Lower Peninsula, was originally covered with a heavy growth of trees, including many good varieties of pines, of which a cork pine was outstanding. With greatly expanded populations in the Mid-West, an active demand existed for the type of lumber available in the area and so the logging off of vast sections of the State became a lucrative business. This activity meant much to woodsmen, railroads, shippers, and saw mill

operators. A similar situation existed in Wisconsin. However, the cutting of timber left many small towns and many people in need of substitute businesses and employment. The logging had required a very large number of horses, and so with men and horses available there was a strong movement to produce crops on the cutover land. There was a particularly strong interest in cash crops to buy supplies not available from local farm production.

Operational Failures in the Area

The early attempts at establishing successful beet sugar operations in the area failed chiefly because of lack of knowledge and experience. Most of the other failures resulted from the lack of suitable locations and adequate organizations.

As is generally known, the beet sugar industry of this country stemmed from successful European operations. One of the fallacious early reports from Europe indicated that sugar beets would grow well on sandy soils and would do especially well if located near bodies of water. Perhaps that report explains in part some of the serious mistakes which were made in locating certain of the early factories in the area. For example, the factory at Menominee, Michigan was located on Green Bay at the lower tip of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, although there was no land in that Peninsula or the northern part of Wisconsin suitable for the production of the crop. While the factory operated for a considerable period of years, the beets were obtained at long distances in southeastern Wisconsin and they were shipped through the city of Green Bay, where another factory struggled for years to obtain an adequate supply of beets. A factory was built in Charlevoix, Michigan, on Lake Michigan far from land suitable for the crop. Another factory was built at East Tawas on Lake Huron at a considerable distance to the north of the good soil area in the Saginaw Valley. Other factories were built in sandy soil areas at Benton Harbor, Kalamazoo, Holland, and Rochester in Michigan, as well as at Chippewa Falls in Wisconsin. The locations of so many factories on shore lines also added to the transportation problem, since the factories were not completely surrounded by farming areas.

Concerning the selection of the site at East Tawas, Gutleben reported in 1954: "There is no one now living who remembers the science and

logic, if any there were, under which this place of beauty and inspiration was selected for the establishment of a sugar estate. To the east of the factory there was nothing but water while in every other direction the only thing that could be seen was dense forest or barren hills."

The rush to build factories was so great that operating organizations could not be recruited from experienced personnel. It appears that 20 factories (not counting a distillery at Bay City) were built in Michigan alone during the short period of 1898-1903, although there had been no successful operation in the State prior to 1898. Moreover, 45 factories were built in the U. S. in that same period, by which time there were only a very few successful operations in the country. The craze to build factories when so few skilled artisans were available necessarily meant that most of the construction was handled by inexperienced men. Furthermore, the scramble to build factories left relatively few qualified men available for operating the factories and carrying out the agricultural work. That situation undoubtedly resulted in many unnecessary failures.

Sugar Bounty

The building of factories in Michigan was spurred by the approval of a State sugar bounty.

As recounted by Gutleben, the Michigan Legislature passed the sugar bounty bill on March 26, 1897, offering the beet processors a bounty of one cent per pound for sugar produced in Michigan from Michigan-grown beets, provided that the purity of the product was at least 90 and the farmers received at least \$4 per ton for beets of 12 percent sugar content.

Part of the bounty for the 1898 crop was apparently paid notwithstanding adverse court action. In September of 1900, the Michigan Supreme Court declared the bounty unconstitutional. By that time, it appears that \$28,451 had been paid out and outstanding claims totaled \$322,000.

Bay City As A Sugar Center

In any significant survey of the early history of the beet sugar industry of the United States and Ontario (Canada), the name of Bay City pops

up amazingly often. Contributing to this fact are the following points: (a) The current trend at the turn of the century was the substitution of "beets for trees" and Bay City was a substantial lumber center, (b) Bay City was the railway outlet for Northeastern Michigan, (c) Bay City was an important Great Lakes shipping point, (d) Bay City was the outlet for a fairly large river system by which many logs were floated to its saw mills, (e) the lumber business was dwindling (approximately 50 saw mills in the city had ceased operations by 1902) and hence railway and steamship businessmen, who had profited greatly from the lumber business, had money to invest, (g) the beet sugar factories in Bay City were slicing more beets than were being processed in any other town in the country, and (h) the operation of several factories in the city developed a wealth of experienced beet craftsmen who could be induced into employment elsewhere in the country.

Saginaw Bay constitutes an extensive water route into the part of Michigan including Bay City and Saginaw. Incidentally, the Saginaw River has been kept open for Lake shipping as far as the City of Saginaw, approximately 20 miles from Saginaw Bay. During recent years, the largest tonnage has been going to the grey iron foundry of the General Motors Corporation in Saginaw. For a number of years, the Defoye shipyard in Bay City has had extensive U. S. Navy contracts.

A considerable area of Michigan is drained into Saginaw Bay through the Saginaw River, which extends only a few miles South of the City of Saginaw to the confluence of five rivers. These rivers are the Tittabawsee (from the northwest), the Bad and the Shiawassee (from the southwest), the Flint (from the southeast) and the Cass (from the northeast).

A review of the names of people who made substantial investments in the beet sugar industry during the early years includes members of 20 to 30 Bay City families. The lumber, shipping and related businesses had created considerable wealth for which profitable investments were sought. As a single example, James E. Davidson operated a small shipyard in Bay City and a fleet of Lake boats. He became the principal owner and the operator of the beet sugar factories at Mount Clemens, (Michigan) and Janesville (Wisconsin).

For a considerable period of years, three factories operated annually in Bay City and for a few years it appears that four were in operation before two were consolidated.

The combined operations of the Bay City factories represents a very substantial record. The factory now operated by the Coryells apparently will go through its 61st campaign on the 1962 crop. The West Bay City Sugar Company operated steadily through 38 campaigns. The other two factories accounted for about 35 campaigns. This makes a total of 134 campaigns within one relatively small city.

Since some confusion exists because of reference to Bay City as a location of several factories, it might help clarify the situation to report that the factory of the Monitor Sugar Company is situated in Salzburg—the southwest part of the city. Two of the factories were located on the Saginaw River in Essexville, a division in the northeast part of the city. The factory of the West Bay City Sugar Company was located on the river in the northwestern part of the city, slightly upstream and across from the Essexville location.

Wasteful Competition

As might be expected from an over-expanded and poorly-organized industry, many failures and innumerable losses resulted from wasteful competitive practices.

There were heavy losses in transportation, including solicitation of acreages, servicing growers, furnishing laborers and assembling beets at the factories. The fact that a lot of beets were secured in Ontario by a number of companies for a considerable period of years added substantially to wasteful transportation.

Unrealistic prices for beets were offered at times, and special concessions were common. In the purchase of beets, weight concessions were not unusual, not only in reduced percentages of tare, but in actual padded weights. Where there was stiff competition between companies, as was common when two or more companies were operating weighing stations at a single railway point, growers were allowed to unload large quantities of dirt with the beets, rather than weighing the dirt out with the empty wagons. At times the growers were furnished shovels to clean out the wagons. Under such conditions, it was inevitable that extra dirt would be loaded with the beets at the farms so it could be sold to the companies.

The extreme competition between companies for volume also meant the installation of far too many weighing stations. These were expensive, even if the installations were not elaborate at that time. A related effect also was costly. The railways were unable to spot empty cars or withdraw loaded cars too promptly from the numerous stations. Accordingly, many beets had to be piled along the railway right-of-ways or in adjoining fields, and usually the beets were piled on ill-prepared ground, causing extra losses of beets. Trash and dirt in such piles contributed substantially to deterioration. Local farmers earned extra money by reloading the beets into wagons and thence to cars during the latter part of the campaign. These circumstances added substantially to company costs for beets.

To meet operating expenses and to finance early settlements with growers, discounted prices for sugar were the rule rather than the exception. The standard practice of selling beet sugar below the prevailing cane sugar price evidently began as early as 1898.

Another form of tough competition took the form of buying beets which had been grown for another company. The other company often had furnished the seed, fieldman service, labor and even cash advances. For special delivery privileges or extra prices, sometimes offered in cash to drivers of wagons lined up for unloading at the factory of a competitor, beets could be acquired with only small development investments. This situation was particularly acute at Bay City when three or four factories were in operation simultaneously. The companies eventually learned that good competition could be healthy and often beneficial, but that cut-throat competition could be ruinous.

Sugar Beet Pulp

The disposition of sugar beet pulp in the Great Lakes Area constituted more of a problem during the early years of the industry than was experienced in the West, primarily because of differences in the livestock industry. While most of the farms in the area maintained some livestock, the numbers were very small in comparison with the large specialized feeding operations of the West. Accordingly, there was only mild interest shown by farmers in the area in teaming the wet pulp from the factories to the farms for feeding purposes. Moreover, so far as I know, a practice which was fairly common in the West was never adopt-

ed in the area, namely, the shipping of wet pulp back to sugar beet receiving stations so as to be more accessible to the sugar beet growers. It is likely that the demand did not warrant such special arrangements.

While some wet pulp was hauled from the factories in the area, most of the pulp remained in the large settling basins or pits into which it was run during the processing campaigns. With the advent of warm weather, the pulp remaining in the pits deteriorated quite rapidly and the resulting stench was very obnoxious. Under these circumstances, relatively early installations of pulpdriers were made in a number of the factories in the area, although they were not very efficient.

An improvement in efficiency of subsequent installations followed the acquisition of certain German patents for a modest sum by James E. Larrowe and Henry Vallez. While both of these men, who were very active in a number of phases of the industry throughout the country, made considerable money in their pulpdrying ventures, Larrowe profited most, not only because he continued the installation work over a longer period, but because he made profitable use of the dried pulp in his extensive livestock feed business, using the trade name "Larro."

During the early period, pulp driers were installed in many of the existing mills under an arrangement whereby the dried pulp was contracted for at a reasonable price and credit was extended to the factory owners through which they became the owners of the drying equipment upon the production of a predetermined tonnage of dried pulp. It is believed that Larrowe installed about 20 of these driers around the country and his profits were very substantial, particularly because many of his contracts extended through the period of World War I when prices of general feeds were high and his pre-contracted price for pulp represented only a small fraction of the current value.

In addition to his dried pulp business, Larrowe built about 10 of the beet sugar factories of the country. Late in his period of operations, he also made another strike in the development of "MSG" (monosodium glutamate).

Most of the factories built subsequent to World War I were equipped originally with pulp driers, and wet pulp has become obsolete except in a few locations in the West.

Participation Without Information

As background material for the following reports on beet contracts, it should be noted that although growers participated in percentages of average packs of sugar per ton of beets and the prices for beets were partly determined upon average prices for sugar, growers were generally considered as not entitled to any information as to what happened to beets after entering the factory. This included data on the production of sugar, pulp and molasses, as well as on net proceeds therefrom. The attitude of the processors may have stemmed in part from the typical rugged-individualistic attitude of businessmen of the times, and also from rough competition between companies, with growers frequently dealing with two or more companies.

All efforts to promote cooperation during the early years fell on deaf processor-ears. During the period of World War I, a large mass meeting of growers was held in Saginaw with the idea of developing better relationships. Typical of the times was the concluding admonition to the growers as made by the most influential processor of the area, "Aw, go home and slop the hogs."

Beet Contracts in Michigan

The general practice of contracting for beets in the early years involved fixed prices per ton. For my own farm, the 1919 contract called for a minimum of \$10 per ton plus additional payments if the price of sugar exceeded \$9.00 per hundredweight. Such a price, of course, reflected war time values. I believe that the break in sugar prices of 1920-21 caused heavy losses for most companies.

A brief review of the contracts for my crops of 1921-31 shows significant variations. The 1921 contract provided that beet prices per ton would exceed slightly the price realized per hundredweight of sugar. For many years the price of sugar was determined by averaging Willett and Gray's net cash quotations for the Michigan-Ohio-Indiana-Illinois area for the months of October through January.

For 1924, the contract provided for a price determined at the value of 45 percent of the average pack of sugar per ton of beets at the factories

in Michigan employing similar contracts, using a price for sugar as specified for 1921. For the 1929 crop, the 45 percent was continued, but the average price of sugar was the actual invoiced basis.

For 1931, the contract called for 45 percent of the value of the average pack at the Salzburg factory at the net price of sugar realized by the company for October through January, with a minimum price of \$6.50 per ton. I am uncertain regarding the 1932-crop contract. However, for 1933 the participating, or so-called "50-50 contract," became effective.

Development of the 50-50 Contract

By 1931 the effect of the depression following the stock market break of 1929 had caused the prices of farm products to recede to extremely low levels. The outlook for sugar prices was so discouraging that in the early months of 1931 it appeared that most of the beet sugar factories in the area would be idle. In fact, there was firm announcement of operating intentions for only one mill in Michigan. This was the Sebewaing factory of the Michigan Sugar Company, which was the only factory to be operated that year by that company.

For the 1930-crop season, 16 factories had operated in the area. The count finally reached 9 for 1931 and for 1932 the 16 total was regained. The high level for operations subsequent to 1929 was reached in 1936, when 21 factories were operated.

Mr. Daniel Euler was manager of the St. Louis factory throughout the depression. In the early months of 1931, he was ordered to close the office at St. Louis, since the operation of the mill did not appear to be feasible. Mr. Euler had formerly been a farmer in Ohio and later a field-men of the Continental Sugar Company. While in Ohio he had been a party to a number of discussions regarding the possibility of operating upon a percentage divisional basis. Instead of closing the office at St. Louis, he sought the operation of the mill on some basis which would permit the processing company to operate the mill without incurring prohibitive price guarantees. He argued that labor was plentiful and in sore need of employment. The price of most farm crops had fallen so low that farmers were in desperate need of cash returns to meet tax and interest charges. It was obvious that the factory owners could not obtain a return on their investment if the mill was to remain idle. He obtained

a commitment from the processor (Larrowe-Edgar-Havemeyer) to operate on a 50-50 percent basis. While growers would not have a guaranteed minimum price, they would receive a price representing 50 percent of the net proceeds derived from sugar, pulp and molasses. The processor retained the other half of such proceeds for supplying and operating the factory.

I was attracted to this new plan of operation when Euler first mentioned it as a possibility. It not only seemed ideally suited to the emergency situation, but it offered much promise as a regular basis of operation. For greatest success, it would require a high level of grower-processor cooperation. Euler and I had become very friendly during former years through my Extension efforts. It was natural, therefore, that I should promote the new arrangement. I helped organize a local growers association and encouraged the participation of farmers in the arrangement. For the following season (1932), I helped sell F. L. Crawford in using a similar contract at the Alma factory, which had been leased by him while his duties as secretary and sales manager for the Michigan Sugar Company were at a minimum because of the curtailment of operations of that company.

In the organization of local growers associations, I was ably assisted by Gifford Patch, an Extension economist for MSU. In 1932 we obtained a commitment for a Federal loan to lease and operate the Lansing factory in the name of the Lansing Sugar Beet Growers Assn., which Association we promptly set up. The processing was sub-leased to Crawford (for operation along with Alma under the name of the Crystal White Sugar Company). In the deal at Lansing, the growers undertook the full agricultural costs, including fertilizer and field labor, an arrangement which caused tough financing problems during the period of general bank closings.

For the 1932 crop season, there were several operations under the 50-50 arrangement. The plan was so successful that for 1933 it was used at all factories in the Great Lakes Area, though with modifications at Ottawa, Green Bay and Menominee.

We organized local beet growers organizations as fast as the processors could be converted to such a high degree of cooperation. It should be noted that this represented a big switch in policy from "tell them nothing" to rendering full reports on products made and net proceeds derived therefrom.

The local associations were promptly federated in the F&M. Perhaps my most significant contributions to this entire development was in selling the processors on the advantages and possible permanent gains in working closely with organized growers.

There has not been a serious strike on the part of growers or controversy over contract terms since this type of contract was introduced, except for a problem which arose one year in the Blissfield area. A rather serious controversy arose in that district primarily because of information which was furnished to the growers by a man who had been forced out of the managership of the processing company.

In general, the relationship between the growers and processors was improved significantly under this type of contractual relationship. In most districts, the growers became responsible for delivering the beets directly to the factories. This permitted the abandonment of most of the outlying weighing stations. As one important result, the shrinkage between the tonnage of beets purchased and the tonnage processed was very largely eliminated. In fact, through delayed and controlled deliveries of beets, the tonnage of beets sliced in many cases exceeded the tonnage purchased. This was a new experience for the industry in the area and it resulted from the fact that while deductions were made from gross weights on account of excessive amounts of crowns remaining on the beets, such excess amounts actually remained on the beets and were weighed into the factories.

Any discussion of the participating type of contract should not be concluded without reporting that at the time of adoption of the 50-50 division it was not intended to be scientific and was not expected to remain in effect indefinitely. It did seem to be a reasonable starting point. During recent years some changes have been incorporated and more may be in prospect as conditions warrant.

Grower Representatives

The interests of growers in the production and returns from sugar and by-products justified special action by grower groups to safeguard their interests. In the inauguration of the Lansing operation in 1932, Patch and I encouraged the hiring of P. V. Goldsmith, who had had experience in both beet and cane operations. For the 1933 campaign, he also checked on operations at two other factories. Subsequently he became

the growers' field secretary in the F&M. Upon his retirement, Loren Armbruster continued the work.

Changes in Farm Interest

The change in farmer interest in sugar beet production has been a most important factor in the beet production record. It appears impossible to explain adequately the difference between beet production during the early years as compared with the current situation. The most significant change, of course, has occurred in the harvesting of the crop. The mechanical harvester of today not only takes the beets from the ground, topping them at the same time, but also loads them into trucks with very little effort on the part of the farmer. Even with hiring the stoop labor in former years, growers were required to fork the beets into wagons, haul the loads over comparatively poor roads and then unload the beets with forks. Of course, all loading, unloading and piling is done now with efficient machinery.

The development of combine harvesters, hay balers and improved farming equipment has tended to promote the production of other crops which require much less attention than beets. In Michigan, for example, thousands of farmers are working steadily for such concerns as the Dow Chemical Company and the General Motors Corporation, while farming as a side line. In contrast with former horse operations, tractors can be operated for longer periods. Also, tractors haul wider tools. One man can readily accomplish in the extra hours of a regular day, plus those of a week-end, a great deal more than several men working steadily could do formerly. This change in the interest of farmers in certain crops has been an important factor in the reduction of beet operations in the area, particularly those which were marginal for other reasons.

The development and use of trucks has also played an important part in the industry. The trucks not only handle many more tons per load as compared with wagons, but can cover much greater distances. Sugar companies have been able to close innumerable weighing stations at outlying points because a much greater percentage of the crop is now delivered by trucks directly to the factories where the beets are processed. At the factories, the beets can be stored more satisfactorily and significant strides have been made in reducing deterioration of the beets

by proper piling, aeration of the piles, use of chemicals, and by other means. A very high percentage of the crop in the area is grown now on tile drained land. Most of this land is low-lying and comparatively level, with a heavy clay subsoil.

Sugar Company Changes

The listing of companies for the area in American Beet Sugar Companies for 1934-35 names 15 companies having 24 factories. However, certain of the companies and factories were inactive. For 1949-50, the listing shows 7 companies and 17 factories. For the 1962 crop season, the numbers will be 4 and 8. Despite these changes, the tonnages of beets have remained surprisingly constant.

Since 1934, all of the companies of the area, except the Michigan Sugar Company, have been "through the wringer" in one way or another. However, the Michigan Company has gone through an extensive attrition process.

In 1924, the Owosso Company was bargained off to the Michigan Company. This included the Lansing and Owosso factories. The term "bargained" is used because the Pitcairn interests (Pittsburgh Plate Glass, etc.) accepted stock in the settlement. In an attempt to protect their interest subsequently, they moved Geoff Childs and Edward C. Bostock in as operating officials. The attrition included the dismantling of the Lansing, Owosso and Bay City factories. Subsequently, the company acquired and scrapped the idle Mt. Pleasant factory. The Alma factory has been dismantled, in part at least. Apparently an unsuccessful switch from a coal to a gas power plant hastened the closing. The shrinking of the producing territory largely to the Saginaw-Thumb area has been accomplished without much loss of acreage and with many efficiency gains.

According to recent reports, the Flegenheimer-Lobo combination bought out the Pitcairn interest in the Michigan Sugar Company. There has been little exterior evidence of this switch, however, except for a change in sugar brokers and a diversion of Illinois beets to Michigan plants following the announced closing of beet operations at Green Bay.

The Great Western Sugar Company surprised many people with the acquisition of the Fremont-Findlay-Blissfield factories a few years ago. Although the latter plant has not been reactivated, good progress has been made at the others. The Findlay plant, particularly, has won many high efficiency honors.

The Coryells have made an outstanding success at the old Salzburg factory, which has been largely rebuilt and greatly expanded. Leasing operations of several plants by the Coryell group in the early 1930's were so successful for the Coryells that they bought the Salzburg factory allegedly with part of 1933-crop profits. It may interest a few persons to know that the operation of this factory by the Columbia Sugar Company (originally the German-American Company) during and following World War I was so successful that the company built factories at Paulding (Ohio) and Mt. Pleasant (Michigan). Neither venture was very successful. Mt. Pleasant is situated in an area lacking in suitable soil. The idleness of Paulding for a long period suggests basic problems.

F&M Association.

Much credit for the formation and early success of F&M should go to Mr. Charles Coryell, Sr. I believe that he adapted this idea from his business experiences with salt. He visualized the possible gains from the elimination of unrealistic competition and from cooperative efforts in the betterment of the industry.

The F&M has been very influential in the progress made in the area in the last 30 years. Results have been particularly good in agricultural research and publicity, as well as in the exchange of information among the processing companies.

Scholarship and research grants to MSU have been helpful in the development of technical information and personnel. In this connection it should be noted that several men who obtained training in this manner include Perc A. Reeve, Executive Secretary of F&M, Mark R. Berrett, Director of Research of F&M, and Grant Nichols, Agronomist for Monitor Sugar.

Reasons for Recent Successes

The concentration of acreage to the most suitable land in the area has not only been helpful from organizational and transportation stand-points, but outstanding gains have been made in yields per acre. As one result, the total tonnages processed have held up well despite the sharp reduction in the number of operating factories. The Sugar Beet Journal reports that the five factories now operating in Michigan are slicing more tons of beets than the twelve operating plants sliced in 1940. Data are quoted showing that 12,756 growers produced 1,022,000 tons for 1940, with an average harvested acreage per farm of 8.8 acres and an average tonnage per acre of 9.1 tons, as compared with a 1961-crop record of 3,600 growers, 20.0 acres per farm, 16.3 tons per acre, and 1,178,000 total tons of beets.

Credit for increasing yields per acre undoubtedly should be divided among various contributors. Included would be the growers, the sugar companies, F&M, various agencies of MSU, and the Department. Improvements in seed breeding, fertilization and cultural practices have been most significant factors.

Similar successes have been attained in Ohio, with corresponding contributors. A small group of growers in the Chicago area have maintained the highest yields per acre for any non-irrigated district of the United States.

PART II EXPERIENCES IN SUGAR

Tariff Hearings

As I remember it, my first trip to Washington was made in the late 1920's to represent the growers of the area in a hearing on the sugar tariff. Thus, I had a small part in the futile effort of the domestic sugar industry to obtain protection from the seemingly unbounded supplies of Philippine and Cuban sugars which were unloaded in our markets at whatever reductions in prices were necessary to consummate the sales.

It was in one of the tariff hearings that I had an object lesson in an attempt of a witness to cover too much territory. Throughout the hearing, a smart New York lawyer, representing the Hershey Company, was attempting to trip witnesses, so as to discredit their statements. Good old J. D. Pancake (successor to Hogsett and Blake) had the stand on behalf of the Mountain States Growers Association. He alleged to know plenty about the beet growing business and the producing areas involved, including Wisconsin. The lawyer evidently recognized that J. D. was too far afield, and so he asked a fairly simple question to which anyone familiar with the industry in Wisconsin would have known the answer. When J. D. muffed the question, his otherwise good testimony was negated. When my turn came to testify, I carefully stuck to my own backyard.

Sugar Advisory Committee of the Federal Farm Board

My first trip to Colorado was made to represent the Eastern growers at a conference held by Ex-Governor McKelvie (Nebraska) on behalf of the Federal Farm Board. It was in this meeting that I learned of the organized power of the Colorado and Nebraska growers, who somehow seemed fearful of minority groups. In an open discussion, I twitted them about this concern even though subsequently in the meeting I cooperated with them in nominations for committee memberships.

To my great surprise, I was named to the Sugar Advisory Committee of the Board. This committee of five domestic sugar producers met a couple of times under the supervision of the Board, but did not find any real help for the sugar industry from that source.

Sugar Stabilization Agreement

The development of a sugar stabilization agreement during 1933, under the voluntary marketing agreement authority of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, represented a great amount of intensive effort and it involved hundreds of representatives of the growers and processors of beets and cane, and of the refiners and handlers of sugar. As a representative of the eastern beet sugar group, I took an active part in this development and I was slated to be a member of the control board if and when the arrangement became operative. While the plan was not approved, a lot of the effort was not wasted.

It would seem impossible for a person familiar only with sugar program operations since 1934 to recognize the magnitude of the task of voluntarily developing the controls which were incorporated in the agreement. It took days, weeks, and months of almost literally knocking heads together. Each domestic area considered its problems unique and worthy of special considerations and concessions. The refined sugar quotas were particularly difficult. The Philippine problem was a major matter.

It should not be difficult to believe that the Louisianans were hard to satisfy. The beet sugar group was suffering under a serious split, with many of the Eastern group believing that the extinction of the industry in the Eastern Area was actively sought. The dumping of sugar in this area by Western processors was a sore point. This worry of possible extinction was quickened by the testimony of A. J. S. Weaver, Chief of the Sugar and Rice Section of the Department, before the House Committee on Agriculture during February of 1934 regarding the Jones-Costigan Bill. His discouraging testimony led Congressman Fred Cummings of Colorado (a former grower-spokesman) to ask: "Is it reasonable to say that the object of this bill then is to give us a kind of a shot in the arm and slide us out of business while we are partly unconscious?" Although Mr. Weaver's total reply was negative, he began it with the word "yes." The beet sugar representatives particularly were very unhappy and dubious about the Administration's intentions. Incidentally, I testified in that hearing on behalf of the Eastern beet sugar group.

I was a pacifist in the split within the beet sugar industry between the East and the West, believing that representatives of the West were not too bloodthirsty and that the East would survive. The continuity of the industry in the East has been a surprise to many persons. To be sure, there are tough problems in sugar still to be faced, but the initial task of developing unity within the domestic industry was gigantic, and the work of those who hammered out the agreements should not be forgotten.

Hurried Actions

The Sugar Act of 1937 became effective in September of 1937 and provided for immediate controls on sugar, as well as payments on the 1937 crops of sugar beets and sugarcane. The usual year-end sugar problems were at hand and the 1937 crops were ready for harvest.

The need was terrific for prompt action on control regulations and payment procedures. Forms, procedures, and determinations in wholesale numbers had to be issued hastily. Moreover, actions for 1938 quotas and crops were needed before results for 1937 could be adequately judged. However, the decisions and actions were amazingly suitable. A few of the determinations have never been revised. Most revisions have involved only minor points.

Factory District Unit of Operation

During the early years of the Sugar Program, we operated in the sugar beet States with factory districts as units of operation. This resulted in about 70 units as contrasted with about 275 counties under the current organizational system.

These units were supervised from headquarters in the field by three fieldmen of the Sugar Section, Lowe, Simpson, and Oviatt. (Wilmer Grayson worked in Louisiana on a similar basis). Promptness in dealing with problems was one of the lesser advantages of this general system.

Each sugar beet district comprised from 600 to 1200 growers, all of whom contracted with the local factory and all of whose names were on the mailing list of the local company. This arrangement assured a workable minimum number of growers in each unit. The general practice of companies to divide producing territories avoided overlapping of districts in most States.

For each unit, we organized a District Sugar Beet Control Association. The chairman of the committee was a grower selected by the membership. In most cases he was an official of the local growers association. The chief operational advisor was the local County Agricultural Extension Agent, who usually was able to provide space in his office for sugar program operations. The one paid employee was a clerk-secretary who handled all of the paper work. Since she (in most cases) worked only on the sugar program, there were no delays due to the interference of other work.

These representatives of the sugar beet control association worked very closely with the agricultural manager of the local factory, thus con-

stituting a well-knit unit which was readily able to handle the program work for several hundred beet growers.

The chief disadvantages of this organizational plan were manifest in difficulties of providing completely uniform decisions throughout the entire sugar beet area and the problems that the Department would have encountered in maintaining separate local offices for the numerous agricultural programs which were to become effective. Under the commodity unit system, it would have been necessary to operate a half dozen or more separate offices in each of the major agricultural counties. Under the current arrangement, most of the programs in a county are handled by the local ASCS office.

Credit for Early Successes

While many individuals deserve credit for early successes of the Sugar Program, particular mention should include Doc Bernhardt, Bernie Benidt, Gari Laguardia, George Mills, Earle MacHardy, and Charles Nicholson. Special mention should also be made of the assistance of Bart Boyd and Carl Robbins. Among the lawyers who were helpful in the early years were Bob Shields and John Bagwell. Good help was extended by several persons loaned to the Sugar Section, including Earl Coke of the California Agricultural Extension Service and Roy Cottrell of the Amalgamated Sugar Company.

Much of the credit for the successful operation of the Sugar Program during the early years should go to Joshua Bernhardt.

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS RELATING TO SUGAR SUPPLIES FOR
1962 AND FOR 1963

Continuation of Sequence following Sugar Act Amendments in July 1962

Five supply actions have been taken since the last Sugar Reports went to press, details of which are shown below:

1. USDA to Allocate Global Quota Sugar: (December 5, 1962)

The U. S. Department of Agriculture announced Nov. 27 (press release USDA 4171-62) that it was considering allocation to foreign supplying countries of up to 750,000 short tons of global quota sugar for delivery during the period Jan. 1 - May 31, 1963. Such countries are now invited to submit proposals to supply sugar, stating the extent to which they will purchase U.S. agricultural commodities with the net receipts from the sugar sales.

Countries submitting proposals must be net sugar exporting countries in diplomatic relations with the United States. Allocations of the global quota made in connection with these proposals will be in addition to any other quota a country may have under the U.S. Sugar Act, as amended, and will be subject to payment of the applicable import fee on global sugar and other conditions of Sugar Regulation 811.

Proposals are to be received by the USDA not later than Dec. 20.

The sugar authorized to be imported on this basis will be sold in the United States through normal trade channels.

With respect to countries of the Western Hemisphere, supplying countries which provide for the purchase of U.S. agricultural commodities with 100 percent of the net receipts resulting from sugar sales will be given preference. To the extent that such offerings and acceptances do not fill the quota of 750,000 short tons of sugar, other proposals for less than 100 percent purchase of U.S. agricultural commodities will be considered. If there is any remaining sugar not allocated against proposals to purchase U.S. agricultural commodities, the remaining sugar will be authorized for importation on a first-come first-served basis.

The U.S. agricultural commodities that may be purchased are identified by code and by name on U.S. Bureau of the Census Export Schedule B under the agriculture economic code class. Value of the U.S. agricultural commodities will be determined on the basis of Bureau of the Census export data for these commodities during the calendar year 1963.

Purchases of such agricultural commodities will be made through normal trade channels and must be exported from the United States in calendar year 1963 and must be consumed in the net exporting country producing and exporting the sugar to the United States.

The U.S. Government will sign agreements with foreign governments whose proposals are accepted formalizing the assurances made. Agreements will provide the submission of information through diplomatic channels including the quantity and date of the sugar shipped, proceeds received from such sale, identity of U.S. agricultural commodities and quantity of each commodity purchased. There will be no requirement that the receipts from the sale of the sugar be deposited in a U.S. bank.

2. 1963 Sugar Requirements and Quotas Announced: (December 7, 1962)

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today announced:

(1) A determination of sugar requirements and the establishment of quotas for the calendar year 1963 totaling 9.8 million short tons, raw value;

(2) Authorization for purchase and importation during the period January-May 1963 of 750,000 short tons, raw value, of global quota sugar, and

(3) Establishment of an import fee of 1.40 cents per pound on sugar imported within the global quota. Import fees applicable to sugar imported within specific country quotas, other than that for the Republic of the Philippines will be 0.28 cents per pound on raw sugar and 0.48 cents per pound on direct-consumption sugar. There is no fee on Philippine quota sugar.

The 750,000 tons of global quota sugar authorized for importation during the period Jan. 1-May 31, 1963, will be allocated under terms similar to those applicable in 1962; that is, foreign countries are invited to submit proposals to supply sugar during this period and to state the extent to which they will purchase U.S. agricultural commodities with the net receipts from the sale of the sugar (press release 4269-62).

Proposals submitted to the Sugar Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, on or before Dec. 20, 1962, will be considered simultaneously. Any balance of the 750,000 ton quantity not allocated on the basis of such proposals will be made available thereafter on a first-come first-served basis.

This action makes effective, without change, as of Jan. 1, 1963, the requirements and quotas set forth in a Notice of Proposed Rule Making issued Nov. 27, 1962 (see press release USDA 4171-62). Changes in sugar market conditions since the proposal was made dictated lowering of the import fees from those proposed. Today's action was taken after all views and data submitted by interested persons in response to the Notice of Proposed Rule Making were reviewed and considered.

Quotas for domestic areas and foreign countries that will become effective on Jan. 1, 1963 are shown on page 32.

3. Proposed 1963 Local Sugar Quotas for Hawaii and Puerto Rico Announced: (December 10, 1962)

Estimated 1963 sugar requirements and quotas of 50,000 and 130,000 short tons, raw value, for local consumption in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, respectively, were announced today by the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The proposed quotas are the same as those established for serving the local sugar needs in the calendar year 1962.

During the 12-month period ended Oct. 31, the quantities of sugar distributed for consumption in Hawaii and Puerto Rico, including that lost in refining after charge to local quota, were approximately 44,000 and 115,000 short tons, raw value, respectively.

SUGAR QUOTAS AND PRORATIONS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1963

Area or Country	Quotas	Direct
	and Prorations	Consumption Limit
	Short tons, raw value	
Domestic Beet Sugar	2,698,590	No limit
Mainland Cane Sugar	911,410	" "
Hawaii	1,110,000	33,516
Puerto Rico	1,140,000	147,000
Virgin Islands	15,000	0
Total Domestic Areas	5,875,000	180,516
Republic of the Philippines	1,050,000	59,920
Dominican Republic	322,152	0
Peru	192,152	0
Mexico	192,152	0
Brazil	182,416	0
British West Indies	91,351	0
Australia	40,378	0
Republic of China	35,510	0
French West Indies	30,355	0
Colombia	30,355	0
Nicaragua	25,200	0
Costa Rica	25,200	0
Ecuador	25,200	0
India	20,332	0
Haiti	20,332	0
Guatemala	20,332	0
South Africa	20,332	0
Argentina	20,000	0
Panama	15,177	3,817
El Salvador	10,309	0
Paraguay	10,023	0
British Honduras	10,023	0
Fiji Islands	10,023	0
Ireland	10,000	10,000
Belgium	182	182
Global Quota: Authorized for purchase	750,000	0
For later authorization	754,341	0
Withheld from Net-importing countries	11,173	0
GRAND TOTAL	9,800,000	254,435

In view of the rates of distribution for that period and for other recent years, it is expected that the supply of sugar available within the proposed local quotas announced today will be adequate to meet demand at fair prices.

All persons who wish to submit views or arguments regarding the estimated requirements or proposed quotas may file them with the Director, Sugar Division, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, on or before Dec. 20. The Proposal is scheduled for publication in the Federal Register Dec. 13.

4. Additional Sugar Quota Deficits Determined: (December 12, 1962)

The U. S. Department of Agriculture today announced a determination of additional deficits of 90,000 tons in 1962 sugar quotas. Of these deficits, 15,000 tons are prorated to the Republic of the Philippines and 75,000 tons to the Western Hemisphere countries as a group.

Today's action increasing the Domestic Beet Sugar Area deficit by 50,000 tons, to a total of 295,769 tons is based on recent reports indicating 1962 production and marketing of beet sugar will be significantly lower than earlier estimates.

The increase in the deficit for Mexico by 40,000 tons, to a total of 67,045 tons, is based upon information supplied by that country on the expected deliveries of sugar to the U.S. market before the end of 1962.

The additional 15,000-ton deficit proration to the Republic of the Philippines increases its share of prorated deficits to 35,000 tons and is sufficient to cover sugar expected to arrive before the end of the year.

The 75,000-ton proration to Western Hemisphere countries will be to such countries on a first-come-first-served basis.

5. Allocations of 1963 "Global" Sugar Quota Announced:(December 26, 1962)

The U. S. Department of Agriculture today announced allocation of approximately 114,000 short tons, raw value, of the 750,000 tons of 1963 global sugar quota authorized for purchase and importation during the period Jan. 1 through May 31.

The following allocations were made in accordance with the announcement of Dec. 7 (press release USDA 4301-62) and on the basis of proposals submitted on or before Dec. 20:

<u>Country</u>	<u>Quantity of Sugar Allocated (short tons, raw value)</u>	<u>Percent of Net Receipts Committed for Purchase of Agricultural Commodities</u>
Brazil	57,870	100
South Africa	45,388	40 <u>a/</u>
Dominican Republic	10,400	0

a/ All net proceeds from sale of 18,000 short tons, raw value, no commitment on balance.

The quantity allocated to Brazil was declared to be for immediate shipment, that allocated to South Africa is scheduled for importation during January and February, and that to the Dominican Republic has been declared for importation before March 31.

OTHER ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONSDate announcedNature of action

December 7,
1962

Public hearing to be held Jan. 11, 1963 on fair and reasonable prices for the 1963 crop of Hawaiian sugarcane. The hearing will be in the auditorium of the Hilo Electric Light Company, Ltd., Hilo, Hawaii, beginning at 9 a.m. (See December 12, 1962 Federal Register).

December 18,
1962

Commitment of 22,230 acres from the National Sugarbeet Acreage Reserve to farms in Texas counties including Castro, Deaf Smith and Parmer and an additional 2,500 acres to farms in New Mexico counties including Curry. The commitment, totaling 24,730 acres, which is for the 1964 crop, is expected to yield about 50,000 tons of sugar. The Department also announced it is continuing study of other requests for acreage for new plants proposed for 1964 and 1965 and requests for acreage for expanded processing facilities. (Scheduled for publication in December 22, 1962 Federal Register).

STATISTICAL SERIES IN THIS ISSUEHIGHLIGHTS

1. November 1962 sugar deliveries for continental U.S. consumption, 778,000 short tons, raw value (preliminary) down about 49,000 from October 1962 and down 27,000 tons from November 1961. January-November 1962 deliveries 8,932,000 short tons, raw value, up about 71,000 tons from the January-November 1961 period. Final data for October 1962 deliveries 827,000 -- previously published preliminary as 830,000 tons.
2. Primary distributors' stocks December 1, 1962 were 1,845,169 short tons, raw value (preliminary) up 137,000 tons from a year earlier and up 660,000 tons from end October 1962. During November beet processors' stocks increased by about 486,000 tons, refiners' stocks by about 150,000 tons, and mainland sugarcane processors' stocks by about 29,000 tons; importers of direct-consumption stocks decreased by about 5,000 tons.
3. Charges to quotas January 1 to December 17, 1962 were 9,433, 664 short tons, raw value, leaving a balance of 521,869 tons to be supplied within the 10,000,000 tons total, of which 35,677 tons may be filled with direct-consumption sugar.
4. Regionally, January-October deliveries, 1962 as compared with 1961, were up to 4 regions and down to 1 -- Increases: Western 3.7 percent, South 0.8 percent, Middle Atlantic 0.6 percent, North Central 0.1 percent; Decrease: New England 0.9 percent.
5. Third Quarter 1962 sugar deliveries to industrial buyers were up 4.5 percent from third quarter 1961, but to non-industrial buyers they were down 3.3 percent. Industrial buyers' deliveries increased to all groups except ice cream and dairy products, and the canning and preserving trades; non-industrial buyers' deliveries decreased to the wholesaling and retailing trades.

Table 1 - Sugar supply and disposition by primary distributors, January-October 1962

(Short tons, raw value)

Item	Beet	Importers	Main-land	Refiners		Net total
	proc-essors ^{1/}		cane proc-essors ^{2/}	Raw	Refined	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
SUPPLY						
1. Inventory Jan. 1, 1962	1,268,555	61,944	23,105	596,246 ^{2/}	245,411 ^{2/}	2,195,261
2. Production and movement						
a. Received as direct-consumption sugar	0	261,628	0	0	5,741	267,369
b. Produced from beets or cane	1,308,035	0	188,775	20,665	5,084)	1,342,517 ^{3/}
Less deliveries to refiners	0	0	180,042	0	0)	
c. Receipts of raws by refiners	0	0	0	5,673,916 ^{4/}	0)	- 272,205 ^{5/}
Less raws melted	0	0	0	5,946,121	0)	
d. Refined from raws melted	0	0	0	0	5,900,633	5,900,633
e. Adjustments	<u>234</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>- 108</u>	<u>- 550</u>	<u>- 4,988</u>	<u>- 5,410</u>
f. Sub-total	1,308,269	261,630	8,625	- 252,090	5,906,470	7,232,904
3. Net total supply	2,576,824	323,574	31,730	344,156	6,151,881	9,428,165
DISPOSITION						
4. Distribution for						
a. Quota purposes	2,005,730	271,636	20,413	1,680	5,853,934	8,153,393
b. Export	0	1,238	0	0	57,146	58,384
c. Livestock feed	<u>0</u>	<u>26,335</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>5,235</u>	<u>31,570</u>
d. Sub-total	2,005,730	299,209	20,413	1,680	5,916,315	8,243,347
5. Inventory October 31, 1962	571,094	24,365	11,317	342,476 ^{6/}	235,566 ^{6/}	1,184,818
6. Total distribution and inventory	2,576,824	323,574	31,730	344,156	6,151,881	9,428,165

^{1/} Establishments that acquire no raw sugar from others for refining. Processor-refiners are included with refiners.

^{2/} Includes Mainland cane sugar not charged to quota: Raws, 36,694; Refined, 29,689; Total, 66,383.

^{3/} Production less deliveries of raw sugar to refiners.

^{4/} Includes 175,545 received from mainland cane processors.

^{5/} Receipts of raw sugar by refiners less melt.

^{6/} Includes mainland cane sugar not charged to quota - Raws, 7,574; Refined, 2,437; Total, 10,011.

Table 2 . - Distribution of sugar by primary distributors, January-October 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Continental United States			
Refiners' raw	1,680	4,909	- 3,229
Refiners' refined	5,916,315	5,590,332	+ 325,983
Sub-total	5,917,995	5,595,241	+ 322,754
Beet processors' refined	2,005,730	2,202,037	- 196,307
Importers' direct consumption	299,209	304,183	- 4,974
Mainland sugarcane processors'	20,413	27,217	- 6,804
Total	8,243,347	8,128,678	+ 114,669
For: Export	58,384	46,209	+ 12,175
Livestock feed	31,570	26,977	+ 4,593
Continental consumption 1/	8,153,393	8,055,492	+ 97,901
Puerto Rico	90,871	92,488	- 1,617
Hawaii	39,833	37,950	+ 1,883

1/ Includes deliveries for United States Military forces at home and abroad.

Table 3 . - Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, October 31, 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Refiners' raw	342,476	347,351	- 4,875
Refiners' refined	235,566	256,394	- 20,828
Sub-total 1/	578,042	603,745	- 25,703
Beet processors' refined	571,094	586,469	- 15,375
Importers' direct consumption	24,365	53,241	- 28,876
Mainland sugarcane processors'	11,317	17,543	- 6,226
Total	1,184,818	1,260,998	- 76,180

1/ Included mainland cane sugar not charged to quota; 1962 - Raws, 7,574; Refined, 2,437; Total, 10,011; 1961 - Raws, 7,441; Refined, 6,180; Total, 13,621.

Table 4 . - Distribution of sugar by primary distributors in the continental United States, January-November 1962 and 1961

Item	1962 1/		1961	
	November	January-November	November	January-November
Short tons, raw value				
Refiners	567,053	6,485,048	573,406	6,168,647
Beet processors' refined	183,559	2,189,289	212,094	2,414,131
Importers' direct consumption	17,834	317,043	19,543	323,726
Mainland sugarcane processors'	10,000 2/	30,413	9,610	36,827
Total	778,446	9,021,793	814,653	8,943,331
For: Export	N. A.	58,384	5,358	51,567
Livestock feed	N. A.	31,570	3,863	30,840
Continental Consumption 3/	778,446	8,931,839	805,432	8,860,924

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated. 3/ Includes deliveries for U. S. military forces at home and abroad.

Table 5 . - Stocks of sugar held by primary distributors in the continental United States, December 1, 1962 and November 30, 1961

Item	1962 1/	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Refiners' raw	457,487	371,860	+ 85,627
Refiners' refined	271,048	257,105	+ 13,943
Sub-total	728,535	628,965	+ 99,570
Beet processors' refined	1,057,096	988,465	+ 68,631
Importers' direct consumption	19,538	48,986	- 29,448
Mainland sugarcane processors	40,000 2/	42,013	- 2,013
Total	1,845,169	1,708,429	+ 136,740

1/ Preliminary. 2/ Estimated.

Table 6 . - Mainland sugar: Production and quota charges January-October 1962 and 1961

Item	1962	1961	Change 1961 to 1962
Short tons, raw value			
Production			
Mainland cane	212,662	222,830	-10,168
Domestic beet	1,308,269	1,290,635	+17,634
Total	1,520,931	1,513,465	+ 7,466
Quota charges			
Mainland cane:			
Louisiana sugarcane processors			
For further processing	47,034	67,928	-20,894
For direct consumption	14,828	20,005	- 5,177
Louisiana processor-refiners	80,367	76,611	+ 3,756
Florida sugarcane processors	137,745	101,761	+35,984
Sub-total	279,974	266,305	+13,669
Beet processors	2,005,730	2,202,037	- 196,307
Total	2,285,704	2,468,342	- 182,638

Table 7 . - Sugar receipts of refiners and importers by source of supply 1/ January-October 1962 and 1961

Source of Supply	Raw sugar		Direct-consumption sugar		Total	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Short tons, raw value						
Offshore						
Foreign						
Cuba	0	0	0	0	0	0
Dominican Republic	757,058	348,103	15,961	27,241	773,019	375,344
Mexico	389,083	568,901	8,505	9,163	397,588	578,064
Peru	435,437	441,858	5,196	10,933	440,633	452,791
Philippines	1,037,960	1,192,489	38,029	39,285	1,075,989	1,231,774
Other countries	1,158,519	1,031,235	51,847	60,661	1,210,366	1,091,906
Sub-total	3,778,057	3,582,586	119,538	147,293	3,897,595	3,729,879
Domestic						
Hawaii	949,080	922,692	5,741 2/	0	954,821	922,692
Puerto Rico	756,895	820,199	142,090	139,547	898,985	959,746
Virgin Islands	10,750	0	0	0	10,750	0
Sub-total	1,716,725	1,742,891	147,831	139,547	1,864,556	1,882,438
Total offshore	5,494,782	5,325,477	267,369	286,840	5,762,151	5,612,317
Mainland cane area	196,210	172,131	5,084 3/	15,070	201,294	187,201
Acquired for reprocessing and samples	3,589	5,506	0	0	3,589	5,506
Grand total	5,694,581	5,503,114	272,453	301,910	5,967,034	5,805,024

1/ Includes sugar as detailed in Table 8. 2/ Refined sugar received by refiners. 3/ Refined sugar produced direct from cane by processor-refiner.

Table 8 . - Receipts of quota-exempt and over-quota sugar included in Table 7

Purpose	Refiners		Importers		Total	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Short tons, raw value						
For: Export	60,634	37,198	6,503	5,039	67,137	42,237
Livestock feed	5,758	924	28,817	43,000	34,575	43,924
Later release						
Bonded	0	0	0	0	0	0
In customs custody	0	7,394	0	3,862	0	11,256
Total	66,392	45,516	35,320	51,901	101,712	97,417

Table 9 Status of 1962 quotas and charges as of November 30, 1962

Area	:	:	:	Balances
	:	:	:	: Direct
	:	Quota	Charges <u>1/</u>	: Consumption
	:	:	:	Total : Limits
Short tons, raw value				
Domestic Beet <u>2/</u>	2,550,000	2,189,289	360,711	
Mainland Cane <u>2/</u>	795,000	480,000	315,000	
Hawaii <u>2/</u>	1,080,000	1,046,708	33,292	28,505
Puerto Rico <u>2/</u>	890,000	902,684 <u>3/</u>	-0-	1,401
Virgin Islands <u>2/</u>	<u>11,000</u>	<u>10,751</u>	<u>249</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Total Domestic	5,326,000	4,629,432	709,252	29,906
Republic of the Philippines				
Quota	1,070,000	1,070,000	-0-	-0-
Non-quota purchase	182,401	182,401	-0-	-0-
Other foreign countries				
January-June				
Quota	162,538	122,745	0 <u>4/</u>	-0-
Non-quota purchase	1,421,811	1,404,773	0 <u>4/</u>	-0-
July-December				
Quotas and deficit allocations (details below)	1,234,849 <u>5/</u>	1,152,427	82,626	9,720
Global quota	<u>602,401</u>	<u>599,092</u>	<u>3,309</u>	<u>-0-</u>
Total other foreign countries	3,421,599	3,279,037	85,935	9,720
Total all areas	10,000,000	9,160,870 <u>6/</u>	795,187	39,626

Details for quota prorated by countries, July-December 1962

Argentina	10,000	9,955	45	-0-
Australia	16,534	16,675	-0-	-0-
Belgium	91	91	-0-	-0-
Brazil	215,131	212,597	2,534	-0-
British Honduras	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
British West Indies	168,955	168,284	671	-0-
China, Republic of	14,540	14,540	-0-	-0-
Colombia	22,930	22,930	-0-	-0-
Costa Rica	18,450	17,172	1,278	368
Dominican Republic	296,726	294,831	1,895	-0-
Ecuador	51,034	50,617	417	3
El Salvador	14,471	14,203	268	-0-
Fiji Islands	4,104	4,104	-0-	-0-
French West Indies	31,230	31,130	100	-0-
Guatemala	28,103	26,354	1,749	3
Haiti	31,875	31,571	304	45
India	8,325	-0-	8,325	-0-
Ireland	5,000	5,000	-0-	-0-
Mexico	51,635	-0-	51,635	-0-
Nicaragua	10,319	1,018	9,301	9,301
Panama	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Paraguay	4,104	-0-	4,104	-0-
Peru	222,967	223,030	-0-	-0-
South Africa	8,325	8,325	-0-	-0-
Total	1,234,849	1,152,427	82,626	9,720

1/ Domestic beet and Mainland sugar marketings partly estimated; all other sugar entered authorized for entry or set aside as of November 30, 1962.

2/ Despite deficits declared, full quotas remain available as follows: Domestic beets, 2,795,769; Mainland cane, 944,231; Hawaii, 1,110,000; and Puerto Rico, 1,140,000; and Virgin Islands, 15,000.

3/ In addition, 333 tons of raw sugar and 21 tons of direct-consumption sugar were brought in for subsequent return to Puerto Rico.

4/ Unfilled balance expired June 30, 1962.

5/ Basic quotas 533,805 tons and deficit allocations 701,044.

6/ Included raw sugar for direct-consumption from Haiti, 1,130; Puerto Rico, 2,406.

Table 10 Other foreign countries charges (except Philippines), January 1-November 30, 1962, Detail for Table 9.

County or Area	January-June		July 1 to date			Total
	Non-quota	Basic	Country	Allocation	Global	
	Purchase	Quota	Basic	Deficit	Quota	
Short tons, raw value						
Argentina	0	0	9,955	0	0	9,955
Australia		0	16,675	0	131,946	148,621
Belgium	888	91	91	0	793	1,863
Brazil	79,830	0	74,205	138,392	103,670	396,097
British Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0
British West Indies	10,404	42	37,375	130,909	0	178,730
Canada	0	316	0	0	3,338	3,654
China, Republic of	52,664	1,901	14,540	0	52,725	121,830
Colombia	29,954	0	12,430	10,500	307	53,191
Costa Rica	8,100	1,896	9,951	7,221	0	27,168
Dominican Republic	430,099	48,550	142,176	152,655	68,240	841,720
Ecuador	0	0	10,011	40,606	16,782	67,399
El Salvador	4,982	0	3,953	10,250	0	19,185
Fiji Islands	4,961	0	4,104	0	6,689	15,754
French West Indies	4,924	0	12,343	18,787	7,730	43,784
Guatemala	4,985	0	7,558	18,796	1,531	32,870
Haiti	1,380	1,156	8,244	23,327	0	34,107
Hong Kong	0	2	0	0	41	43
India	98,187	0	0	0	38,096	136,283
Ireland	4,987	0	5,000	0	0	9,987
Mexico	357,627	39,957	0	0	0	397,574
Netherlands	3,100	1,970	0	0	2,249	7,319
Nicaragua	30,893	5,578	1,018	0	0	37,489
Panama	2,555	1,219	0	0	0	3,774
Paraguay	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru	274,263	19,809	78,689	144,341	0	517,102
South Africa	0	0	8,325	0	84,795	93,120
Turkey	0	0	0	0	65,033	65,033
United Kingdom	0	258	0	0	1,484	1,742
West Germany	0	0	0	0	1	1
Mauritius	0	0	0	0	13,642	13,642
Total	1,404,773	122,745	456,643	695,784	599,092	3,279,037

1/ In addition to quantities shown there is in customs custody 192 tons from Belgium; 60 from Canada; 8 from Hong Kong.

Table 11 Quota-exempt sugar 1/ entered under sections 211 (a) and 212 (4), January 1-November 30, 1962.

Source	Reexport	Feed	Total
Short tons, raw value			
Australia	12,296	0	12,296
Belgium	707	6,326	7,033
Brazil	3,436	5,049	8,485
Canada	32	342	374
Colombia	590	586	1,176
Costa Rica	0	6	6
Dominican Republic	21,217	17,605	38,822
French West Indies	16,751	606	17,357
Haiti	4,271	0	4,271
Netherlands	295	0	295
Peru	6,971	0	6,971
Turkey	377	18,893	19,270
Union of South Africa	1,385	4,899	6,284
United Kingdom	4,008	988	4,996
India	2,589	0	2,589
Total	74,925	55,300	130,225

1/ In addition a total of about 536 tons were entered under provisions of Section 212 exempting the first 10 tons and liquid sugar in small containers.

Table 12. - Status of 1962 quotas and charges as of December 17, 1962.

Area	Quotas	Charges 1/	Balances	
			Total	Direct
				Consumption Limits
Short tons, raw value				
Domestic Beet 2/	2,500,000	2,269,000	231,000	-
Mainland Cane 2/	795,000	620,000	175,000	-
Hawaii 2/	1,080,000	1,061,872	18,128	28,505
Puerto Rico 2/	890,000	904,261	0	178
Virgin Islands 2/	11,000	10,751	249	0
Total Domestic	5,276,000	4,865,884	424,377	28,683
Republic of the Philippines				
Quota	1,085,000	1,069,706	13,140	0
Non-quota Purchase	182,401	182,401	0	0
Other foreign countries				
January-June				
Quota	162,538	122,745	4/	0
Non-quota Purchase	1,421,811	1,404,773	4/	0
July-December				
Quota and deficit allocations (details below)	1,269,849 5/	1,190,278	79,828	6,994
Global quota	602,401	597,877	4,524	0
Total other foreign countries	3,456,599	3,315,673	84,352	6,994
Total	10,000,000	9,433,664	521,869	35,677
Details for quota prorated by countries, July-December 1962				
Argentina	10,000	9,949	51	0
Australia	16,534	16,675	0	0
Belgium	91	91	0	0
Brazil	215,131	211,743	3,388	0
British Honduras	0	0	0	0
British West Indies	168,955	167,852	1,103	0
China, Republic of	14,540	14,616	0	0
Colombia	22,930	22,930	0	0
Costa Rica	18,450	17,172	1,278	368
Dominican Republic	310,122	309,639	483	0
Ecuador	51,034	50,407	627	3
El Salvador	14,471	14,155	316	0
Fiji Islands	4,104	4,104	0	0
French West Indies	31,230	31,093	137	0
Guatemala	28,103	26,354	1,749	3
Haiti	31,875	31,846	29	0
India	8,325	8,325	0	0
Ireland	5,000	5,000	0	0
Mexico	11,635	0	11,635	0
Nicaragua	10,319	3,699	6,620	6,620
Panama	0	0	0	0
Paraguay	4,104	0	4,104	0
Peru	236,291	236,303	28	0
South Africa	8,325	8,325	0	0
Unallotted	48,280	0	48,280	0
Total	1,269,849	1,190,278	79,828	6,994

1/ Domestic Beet and Mainland Cane sugar marketings partly estimated; all other sugar entered, authorized for entry or set aside as of December 17, 1962.

2/ Despite deficits declared, full quotas remain available as follows: Domestic beets, 2,795,769; Mainland cane, 944,231; Hawaii, 1,110,000; Puerto Rico, 1,140,000; and Virgin Islands, 15,000.

3/ In addition, 333 tons of raw and 21 tons of direct-consumption sugar were brought in for subsequent return to Puerto Rico.

4/ Unfilled balances expired June 30, 1962.

5/ Basic quotas 533,805 tons and deficit allocations 736,044 tons.

6/ Includes raw sugar for direct-consumption from Haiti, 1,130; Puerto Rico, 2,406.

Table 13. - Other foreign countries charges (except Philippines), January 1 - December 17, 1962, Detail for Table 12.

Country or Area	January-June		July 1 to date			
	Non-quota	Basic	Country	Allocation	Global	
	Purchase	Quota	Basic	Deficit	Quota	Total
	Short tons, raw value					
Argentina	0	0	9,949	0	0	9,949
Australia	0	0	16,675	0	131,949	148,624
Belgium	888	91	91	0	793	1,863 1/2
Brazil	79,830	0	73,678	138,065	102,756	394,329
British Honduras	0	0	0	0	0	0
British West Indies	10,404	42	37,375	130,477	0	178,298
Canada	0	316	0	0	3,338	3,654 1/2
China, Republic of	52,664	1,901	14,616	0	52,322	121,503
Colombia	29,954	0	12,430	10,500	307	53,191
Costa Rica	8,100	1,896	9,951	7,221	0	27,168
Dominican Republic	430,099	48,550	143,523	166,116	68,240	856,528
Ecuador	0	0	10,011	40,396	16,782	67,189
El Salvador	4,982	0	3,905	10,250	0	19,137
Fiji Islands	4,961	0	4,104	0	6,689	15,754
French West Indies	4,924	0	12,340	18,753	7,730	43,747
Guatemala	4,985	0	7,558	18,796	1,531	32,870
Haiti	1,380	1,156	8,325	23,521	0	34,382
Hong Kong	0	2	0	0	41	43 1/2
India	98,187	0	8,325	0	38,096	144,608
Ireland	4,987	0	5,000	0	0	9,987
Mexico	357,617	39,957	0	0	0	397,574
Mauritius	0	0	0	0	13,642	13,642
Netherlands	3,100	1,970	0	0	2,249	7,319
Nicaragua	30,893	5,578	3,699	0	0	40,170
Panama	2,555	1,219	0	0	0	3,774
Paraguay	0	0	0	0	0	0
Peru	274,263	19,809	78,720	157,583	0	530,375
South Africa	0	0	8,325	0	84,795	93,120
Turkey	0	0	0	0	65,132	65,132
United Kingdom	0	258	0	0	1,484	1,742
West Germany	0	0	0	0	1	1
Total	1,404,773	122,745	468,600	721,678	597,877	3,315,673

^{1/} In addition to quantities shown there is in customs custody 192 tons from Belgium; 60 from Canada; 10 from Hong Kong.

Table 14. - Quota-exempt sugar^{1/} entered under sections 211 (a) and 212 (4), January 1 - December 17, 1962.

1962.

Source	For		Total
	Reexport	Feed	
	Short tons, raw value		
Australia	12,296	0	12,296
Belgium	1,208	8,263	9,471
Brazil	3,433	5,045	8,478
Canada	32	342	374
Colombia	590	586	1,176
Costa Rica	0	6	6
Dominican Republic	21,217	17,592	38,809
French West Indies	16,751	606	17,357
Haiti	4,271	0	4,271
Netherlands	295	0	295
Peru	6,971	0	6,971
Reunion	919	0	919
Turkey	377	18,893	19,270
Union of South Africa	1,385	4,899	6,284
United Kingdom	4,008	988	4,996
India	<u>2,589</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>2,589</u>
Total	76,342	57,220	133,562

^{1/} In addition a total of about 538 tons were entered under provisions of Section 212 exempting the first 10 tons and liquid sugar in small containers.

Table 15. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, October, 1962

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	117,798		1,000		118,798
Maine	58,409				58,409
Massachusetts	474,696		620	800	476,116
New Hampshire	28,406				28,406
Rhode Island	42,274		3,300		45,574
Vermont	34,411				34,411
Sub-total	755,994		4,920	800	761,714
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	695,026		57,159		752,185
New York	1,599,403	10,461	60,524		1,670,388
Pennsylvania	1,045,999	18,838	110,973		1,175,810
Sub-total	3,340,428	29,299	228,656		3,598,383
North Central					
Illinois	804,195	955,190	1,000	21,436	1,781,821
Indiana	305,306	78,787	342		384,435
Iowa	48,999	119,264			168,263
Kansas	36,619	89,646		300	126,565
Michigan	261,257	208,056			469,313
Minnesota	38,831	150,159			188,990
Missouri	262,022	142,840	600	400	405,862
Nebraska	19,987	90,805			110,792
North Dakota	9	26,219			26,228
Ohio	672,994	77,220	1,350		751,564
South Dakota	3,774	40,042			43,816
Wisconsin	113,034	174,819			287,853
Sub-total	2,567,027	2,153,047	3,292	22,136	4,745,502
Southern					
Alabama	225,239		2,080	630	227,949
Arkansas	107,329	137			107,466
Delaware	28,189		800		28,989
District of Columbia	31,450		3,543		34,993
Florida	192,466		81,530	13	274,009
Georgia	433,089		2,662		435,751
Kentucky	237,025				237,025
Louisiana	362,489			1,431	363,920
Maryland	345,759		19,456		365,215
Mississippi	156,295			597	156,892
North Carolina	340,075		8,117		348,192
Oklahoma	99,925	15,986			115,911
South Carolina	146,935		705		147,640
Tennessee	296,926			1,000	297,926
Texas	612,515	115,396	9,680	333	737,924
Virginia	241,672		47,233		288,905
West Virginia	95,706	669	2,270		98,645
Sub-total	3,953,084	132,188	178,076	4,004	4,267,352
Western					
Alaska	3,218	745			3,963
Arizona	50,370	18,825			69,195
California	640,625	863,359	32,622		1,536,606
Colorado	7,805	105,298			113,103
Idaho	6,646	25,884			32,530
Montana	3,798	32,164			35,962
Nevada	7,456	5,176			12,632
New Mexico	9,180	14,289			23,469
Oregon	60,509	116,123	449		177,081
Utah	8,115	54,665			62,780
Washington	64,824	167,697			232,521
Wyoming	415	6,566	25,653		32,634
Sub-total	862,961	1,410,791	58,724		2,332,476
Grand total	11,479,494	3,725,325	473,668	26,940	15,705,427

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 16. - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, January-October, 1962

State and region	Cane sugar refiners	Beet sugar processors	Importers of direct- consumption sugar	Mainland cane sugar mills	Total
Hundredweights ^{1/}					
New England					
Connecticut	1,106,737		13,511	1,235	1,121,483
Maine	567,294		300		567,594
Massachusetts	4,267,298		21,820	2,329	4,291,447
New Hampshire	326,625		10		326,635
Rhode Island	400,409		23,338		423,747
Vermont	233,070		25,837		258,907
Sub-total	6,901,433		84,816	3,564	6,989,813
Mid-Atlantic					
New Jersey	6,315,932		588,904	750	6,905,586
New York	14,359,016	145,319	721,085	5,385	15,230,805
Pennsylvania	9,585,762	47,512	1,072,605		10,705,879
Sub-total	30,260,710	192,831	2,382,594	6,135	32,842,270
North Central					
Illinois	7,834,198	8,068,646	27,724	120,760	16,051,328
Indiana	3,140,702	1,034,543	6,611	400	4,182,256
Iowa	456,521	1,376,468	420	8,160	1,841,569
Kansas	356,901	846,958		3,220	1,207,079
Michigan	2,595,001	2,827,486	22,670	600	5,445,757
Minnesota	355,165	1,649,475		5,025	2,009,665
Missouri	2,389,166	1,535,189	3,790	20,450	3,948,595
Nebraska	189,170	1,016,241		3,600	1,209,011
North Dakota	1,843	265,467			267,310
Ohio	6,420,646	937,858	63,623	80	7,422,207
South Dakota	22,818	412,794			435,612
Wisconsin	1,126,698	1,902,666	3,045	5,200	3,037,609
Sub-total	24,888,829	21,873,791	127,883	167,495	47,057,998
Southern					
Alabama	2,271,393		18,360	2,630	2,292,383
Arkansas	1,014,048	23,290		20	1,037,358
Delaware	258,051		6,540		264,591
District of Columbia	316,859		41,784		358,643
Florida	2,229,757		925,717	94,211	3,249,685
Georgia	4,728,649		41,890	10,230	4,780,769
Kentucky	2,251,690		7,116	2,400	2,261,206
Louisiana	3,259,070		562	42,722	3,302,354
Maryland	3,308,633		282,677		3,591,310
Mississippi	1,413,328			7,726	1,421,054
North Carolina	3,314,432		197,694	1,100	3,513,226
Oklahoma	1,085,470	216,001			1,301,471
South Carolina	1,538,866		33,678		1,572,544
Tennessee	3,045,614		3,467	43,346	3,092,427
Texas	6,282,775	1,106,392	46,644	1,743	7,437,554
Virginia	2,159,785	2,800	489,694		2,652,279
West Virginia	823,342	11,832	24,547		859,721
Sub-total	39,301,762	1,360,315	2,120,370	206,128	42,988,575
Western					
Alaska	28,960	16,298			45,258
Arizona	351,447	219,745			571,192
California	6,629,963	8,763,509	177,877	1,000	15,572,349
Colorado	72,501	1,021,938		650	1,095,089
Idaho	55,087	276,943			332,030
Montana	21,935	294,660			316,595
Nevada	63,184	53,050			116,234
New Mexico	90,396	157,251			247,647
Oregon	581,550	1,063,508	72,601		1,717,659
Utah	56,189	567,260			623,449
Washington	606,505	1,558,065	85,676		2,250,246
Wyoming	6,030	73,992			80,022
Sub-total	8,563,747	14,066,219	336,154	1,650	22,967,770
Grand total					

Grand total

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 17 - Primary distribution of sugar, continental United States, by States, January-October 1962 and 1961

State and region	Cane sugar refiners		Beet processors		Total all Primary Distributors	
	1962	1961	1962	1961	1962	1961
Thousands of hundredweights 1/						
<u>New England</u>						
Connecticut	1,107	1,085			1,122	1,114
Maine	567	600			567	600
Massachusetts	4,267	4,298			4,291	4,325
New Hampshire	327	310			327	310
Rhode Island	400	437			424	452
Vermont	233	248			259	254
Sub-total	6,901	6,978			6,990	7,055
<u>Mid-Atlantic</u>						
New Jersey	6,316	6,485			6,905	6,966
New York	14,359	13,849	145	447	15,231	14,977
Pennsylvania	9,586	9,166	48	501	10,706	10,696
Sub-total	30,261	29,500	193	948	32,842	32,639
<u>North Central</u>						
Illinois	7,834	7,077	8,069	8,181	16,051	15,550
Indiana	3,141	2,650	1,035	1,386	4,182	4,042
Iowa	457	503	1,376	1,403	1,841	1,927
Kansas	357	389	847	825	1,207	1,216
Michigan	2,595	2,231	2,828	3,397	5,446	5,636
Minnesota	355	339	1,649	1,775	2,010	2,122
Missouri	2,389	2,202	1,535	1,661	3,949	3,886
Nebraska	189	192	1,016	1,053	1,209	1,252
North Dakota	2	4	265	230	267	234
Ohio	6,420	5,195	938	2,332	7,422	7,538
South Dakota	23	27	413	457	436	484
Wisconsin	1,127	1,320	1,903	1,796	3,038	3,145
Sub-total	24,889	22,129	21,874	24,496	47,058	47,032
<u>Southern</u>						
Alabama	2,271	2,426			2,292	2,440
Arkansas	1,014	968	23	67	1,037	1,035
Delaware	258	213			265	227
District of Columbia	317	344			359	411
Florida	2,230	2,127		*	3,250	3,071
Georgia	4,729	4,671			4,781	4,715
Kentucky	2,252	2,140		59	2,261	2,235
Louisiana	3,259	3,260			3,302	3,292
Maryland	3,309	3,233		9	3,591	3,553
Mississippi	1,413	1,493			1,421	1,503
North Carolina	3,314	2,982			3,513	3,506
Oklahoma	1,085	1,017	216	287	1,301	1,304
South Carolina	1,539	1,513			1,573	1,567
Tennessee	3,046	3,072		42	3,093	3,167
Texas	6,283	5,972	1,106	1,162	7,438	7,192
Virginia	2,160	2,066	3	76	2,652	2,591
West Virginia	823	789	12	27	860	834
Sub-total	39,302	38,286	1,360	1,729	42,989	42,643
<u>Western</u>						
Alaska	29	33	16	16	45	49
Arizona	351	336	220	184	571	520
California	6,630	5,859	8,764	8,886	15,573	14,996
Colorado	73	73	1,022	967	1,095	1,040
Idaho	55	41	277	296	332	337
Montana	22	18	295	304	317	322
Nevada	63	54	53	40	116	94
New Mexico	90	92	157	185	247	277
Oregon	582	558	1,063	963	1,718	1,635
Utah	56	56	567	547	623	603
Washington	607	585	1,558	1,510	2,251	2,190
Wyoming	6	6	74	83	80	89
Sub-total	8,564	7,711	14,066	13,981	22,968	22,152
<u>Grand total</u>	<u>109,917</u>	<u>104,604</u>	<u>37,493</u>	<u>41,154</u>	<u>152,847</u>	<u>151,521</u>

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

2/ Includes deliveries by importers of direct-consumption sugar and mainland cane sugar mills.

* Less than 500 hundredweights.

Table 18. - Sugar deliveries, by type of product or business of buyer and by type of sugar, third quarter, 1962 ^{1/}

Product or business of buyer	:	:	:	:	:	Liquid sugar	
	:	Beet	Cane	Imported	Total	included in totals	
	:	(Total)	(Total)	D. C.	All sugar	:	:
	:	:	:	(Total)	:	Beet	Cane
	Hundredweights <u>2/</u>						
<u>Industrial</u>							
Bakery, cereal and allied products	1,797,627	3,907,573	164,150	5,869,350	41,357	566,623	
Confectionery and related products	1,125,136	2,935,765	148,128	4,209,029	38,966	673,603	
Ice cream and dairy products	757,836	1,646,509	22,433	2,426,778	253,500	1,161,353	
Beverages	1,506,516	5,768,830	124,898	7,400,244	475,904	3,571,930	
Canned, bottled, frozen foods, jams, jellies and preserves	2,687,290	3,270,666	335,569	6,293,525	926,268	2,037,255	
Multiple and all other food uses	1,042,980	1,271,818	92,181	2,406,979	710,422	458,215	
Non-food products	36,602	305,144	29,415	371,161	2,200	116,932	
Sub-total	8,953,987	19,106,305	916,774	28,977,066	2,448,617	8,585,911	
<u>Non-industrial</u>							
Hotels, restaurants, . institutions	14,616	314,944	-	329,560	-	16,332	
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers	3,097,839	9,904,707	768,744	13,771,290	52,221	71,401	
Retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	1,626,881	5,773,786	79,455	7,480,122	11,423	113,882	
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	152,575	380,135	58	532,768	12,754	109	
Sub-total	4,891,911	16,373,572	848,257	22,113,740	76,398	201,724	
TOTAL DELIVERIES	13,845,898	35,479,877	1,765,031	51,090,806	2,525,015	8,787,635	
Deliveries in consumer-size packages (less than 50 lbs.)	3,176,641	12,708,591	209,946	16,095,178			
Deliveries in bulk (unpackaged)	3,482,420	5,184,237		8,666,657			

^{1/} Represents approximately 97.4 percent of deliveries by primary distributors in continental United States.^{2/} Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 19. - Sugar deliveries, by type of product or business of buyer, third quarter 1962 and percentage change from third quarter 1961

Product or business of buyer	United States	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	South	West
Hundredweights 1/						
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	5,869,350	174,678	1,479,094	2,514,224	1,063,354	638,000
Confectionery and related products	4,209,029	327,164	1,891,735	1,332,534	344,094	313,502
Ice cream and dairy products	2,426,778	121,780	503,664	816,339	592,022	392,973
Beverages	7,400,244	233,728	1,524,779	1,844,362	2,879,380	917,995
Canned, bottled, frozen foods; jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	6,293,525	210,723	868,258	1,595,143	755,414	2,863,987
Multiple and all other food uses	2,406,979	35,800	426,938	370,433	116,630	1,457,178
Non-food products	371,161	6,368	87,248	96,669	179,107	1,769
Sub-total	28,977,066	1,110,241	6,781,716	8,569,704	5,930,001	6,585,404
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Hotels, restaurants, institutions	329,560	28,331	52,578	41,159	66,809	140,683
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers	13,771,290	632,893	1,825,779	4,598,598	4,618,174	2,095,846
Retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	7,480,122	386,967	1,570,641	2,075,181	2,744,268	703,065
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	532,768	9,588	61,628	82,065	204,176	175,311
Sub-total	22,113,740	1,057,779	3,510,626	6,797,003	7,633,427	3,114,905
TOTAL DELIVERIES	51,090,806	2,168,020	10,292,342	15,366,707	13,563,428	9,700,309
Percentage change from third quarter 1961						
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	+ 7.6	- 7.3	+ 7.0	+11.9	+ 4.6	+ 2.5
Confectionery and related products	+ 0.6	-18.1	+ 6.3	+ 0.7	- 8.8	+ 3.8
Ice cream and dairy products	- 1.7	- 5.9	-19.0	+ 0.3	+ 9.6	+ 8.1
Beverages	+ 8.4	- 9.5	- 2.4	+ 3.8	+20.2	+ 9.7
Canned, bottled, frozen foods; jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	-11.4	+35.3	-19.0	- 8.2	+ 5.9	-16.4
Multiple and all other food uses	+80.1	+16.0	+21.6	-10.4	-38.5	+314.6
Non-food products	+ 7.9	- 9.3	- 9.5	+35.7	+ 6.6	+46.6
Sub-total	+ 4.5	- 5.0	- 1.2	+ 2.2	+ 9.8	+11.5
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Hotels, restaurants, institutions	+ 1.8	- 0.8	-26.2	+25.8	+12.3	+ 6.8
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers	- 4.7	- 3.3	- 3.4	- 5.5	- 7.0	+ 0.9
Retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	- 1.1	- 7.9	-10.3	- 4.3	+16.5	-18.8
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	+ 0.8	+ 4.3	+19.9	- 9.6	+21.2	-16.0
Sub-total	- 3.3	- 4.9	- 6.7	- 5.1	+ 1.1	- 5.1
TOTAL	+ 1.0	- 5.0	- 3.2	- 1.1	+ 4.8	+ 5.6

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 20. - Deliveries of cane and beet sugar by primary distributors in consumer size packages (less than 50 lbs.) third quarter
1962

Area	Cane sugar	Beet sugar	Total
Hundredweights 1/			
United States	12,918,537	3,176,641	16,095,178
New England	742,996	0	742,996
Middle Atlantic	2,488,451	5,415	2,493,866
North Central and West, combined 2/	3,837,905	3,113,660	6,951,565
South	5,849,185	57,566	5,906,751

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

2/ Combined to avoid disclosure of individual company data. Total reported distribution in consumer size packages in these areas: North Central, 4,657,696; West, 2,293,869.

Table 21. - Deliveries of packaged, bulk, and liquid sugar (beet and cane) by primary distributors during January-September 1962 and 1961 with comparisons

during January-September 1962 and 1961 with comparisons									
January-September	Region						U. S. Total	Type of sugar	
	New	Middle		North					
	England	Atlantic	South	Central	West			Beet	Cane
1,000 hundredweights 1/									
(1) <u>Total direct deliveries</u>									
1962	6,222	29,178	36,259	40,980	20,675	133,314	33,768	99,546	
1961	6,365	29,315	35,782	41,191	20,021	132,674	37,320	95,354	
Change	- 143	- 137	+ 477	- 211	+ 654	+ 640	- 3,552	+ 4,192	
(2) <u>Consumer size packages (granulated, less than 50 lbs.)</u>									
1962	2,084	6,908	15,398	11,979	5,650	42,019	7,498	34,521	
1961	2,220	7,430	16,223	12,629	5,706	44,208	7,781	36,427	
Change	- 136	- 522	- 825	- 650	- 56	- 2,189	- 283	- 1,906	
(3) <u>Other deliveries, industrial and institutional</u>									
1962	4,138	22,270	20,861	29,001	15,025	91,295	26,270	65,025	
1961	4,145	21,885	19,559	28,562	14,315	88,466	29,539	58,927	
Change	- 7	+ 385	+ 1,302	+ 439	+ 710	+ 2,829	- 3,269	+ 6,098	
(a) <u>Bulk granulated</u>									
1962	586	6,375	2,849	9,195	4,039	23,044	8,984	14,060	
1961	530	6,325	2,221	7,543	3,581	20,200	7,976	12,224	
Change	+ 56	+ 50	+ 628	+ 1,652	+ 458	+ 2,844	+ 1,008	+ 1,836	
(b) <u>Liquid sugar</u>									
1962	1,659	8,219	4,594	5,834	5,461	25,767	4,302	21,465	
1961	1,590	7,831	3,927	5,146	5,261	23,755	4,269	19,486	
Change	+ 69	+ 388	+ 667	+ 688	+ 200	+ 2,012	+ 33	+ 1,979	
(c) <u>Industrial and institutional packages (granulated 50 lbs. and over)</u>									
1962	1,893	7,676	13,418	13,972	5,525	42,484	12,984	29,500	
1961	2,025	7,729	13,411	15,873	5,473	44,511	17,294	27,217	
Change	- 132	- 53	+ 7	- 1,901	+ 52	- 2,027	- 4,310	+ 2,283	

1/ Reported as produced or imported and delivered except liquid sugar which is on a sugar solids content basis.

Table 22. - Dextrose sales, by type of product or business of buyer, third quarter 1962 and percentage change from third quarter 1961

Product or business of buyer	United States	New England	Middle Atlantic	North Central	South	West
Hundredweights 1/						
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	1,173,712	52,426	217,622	443,970	309,534	150,160
Confectionery and related products	155,495	717	105,797	34,831	9,112	5,038
Ice cream and dairy products	44,064	1,543	11,531	17,948	6,159	6,883
Beverages	170,914	1,763	79,103	52,022	18,900	19,126
Canned, bottled, frozen foods, jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	176,573	465	21,127	22,659	31,960	100,362
Multiple and all other food uses	150,350	4,055	66,893	36,415	27,348	15,639
Non-food products	353,374	70,651	104,998	106,242	61,415	10,068
<u>Sub-total</u>	2,224,482	131,620	607,071	714,087	464,428	307,276
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Wholesale grocers, jobbers, sugar dealers, retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	56,105	419	2,075	39,810	4,241	9,560
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	16,962	752	3,975	4,961	1,345	5,929
<u>Sub-total</u>	73,067	1,171	6,050	44,771	5,586	15,489
TOTAL SALES	2,297,549	132,791	613,121	758,858	470,014	322,765
Percentage change from third quarter 1961						
<u>Industrial</u>						
Bakery, cereal and allied products	+9.1	+ 6.0	+1.7	+4.5	+24.3	+8.6
Confectionery and related products	+22.6	- 2.0	+13.2	+61.7	+22.2	+40.5
Ice cream and dairy products	-20.1	-63.1	- 7.7	-27.3	-13.9	+ 4.0
Beverages	- 2.4	-71.5	+ 6.7	- 6.0	+ 3.9	- 9.8
Canned, bottled, frozen foods; jams, jellies, preserves, etc.	- 2.0	-54.1	- 8.2	-52.0	- 5.8	+33.7
Multiple and all other food uses	+ 8.1	-28.2	+99.8	-35.8	+ 8.1	-12.8
Non-food products	+ 8.7	+11.9	+41.3	+27.9	-38.3	+104.8
<u>Sub-total</u>	+ 7.1	+ 1.0	+15.7	+ 0.1	+ 5.4	+14.8
<u>Non-industrial</u>						
Wholesale grocer, jobbers, sugar dealers, retail grocers, chain stores, super markets	+ 2.6	-61.3	- 3.5	+ 6.2	- 3.2	- 0.3
All other deliveries, including deliveries to Government agencies	-53.4	-13.4	-61.0	-74.3	+176.2	+ 7.6
<u>Sub-total</u>	-19.8	-40.0	-51.0	-21.2	+14.8	+ 2.5
TOTAL	+ 6.0	+ 0.4	+14.1	- 1.5	+ 5.5	+14.2

1/ Reported as produced and sold (typically dextrose hydrate) and exclude small amounts to competitors as well as small quantities used in miscellaneous mixes.

Table 23 - Sugar prices

Year and month	:Raw cane sugar-spot prices:			: Refined beet sugar - quoted		
	:	:	:	: wholesale (gross) ^{4/} :		
	: Domestic :	:	: Quota :	:	:	:
	:Sugar at N.Y.: "World" :	:	: premiums ^{3/} :	:	: Chicago :	: Pacific
	:duty paid ^{1/} :	: Sugar ^{2/} :	: discounts :	: Eastern :	: West :	: Coast
Cents per pound						
1957-61 Monthly Average	6.27	3.53	+1.82	8.62	8.67	9.01
1960 Monthly Average	6.30	3.14	+2.21	8.79	8.77	8.96
1961 Monthly Average	6.30	2.91	+2.45	8.36	8.59	8.84
1961						
December	6.40	2.46	+2.98	8.55	8.72	8.80
1962						
January	6.45	2.30	+3.23	8.95	8.80	8.80
February	6.37	2.36	+3.10	8.95	8.80	8.80
March	6.43	2.65	+2.89	8.95	8.80	8.80
April	6.43	2.69	+3.86	9.02	8.96	9.00
May	6.43	2.60	+2.95	9.05	9.00	9.03
June	6.45	2.63	+2.94	9.10	9.00	9.20
July	6.39	2.92	+2.59	9.15	9.00	9.20
August	6.54	3.24	+2.42	9.15	9.00	9.20
September	6.43	3.18	+2.37	9.15	9.00	9.20
October	6.52	3.28	+2.35	9.15	9.00	9.20
November	6.44	3.65	+1.90	9.15	9.00	9.20
Last 12-Month Average	6.44	2.83	+2.72	9.03	8.92	9.04
: Refined						
Year and Month	: Refined Cane Sugar - Quoted Wholesale (Gross) ^{4/} :					: Retail
	: North :	: South :	:	: Chicago :	: Pacific :	: U. S.
	: East :	: East :	: Gulf :	: West :	: Coast :	: Average
Cents per pound						
1957-61 Monthly Average	9.32	9.19	9.18	8.86	9.05	11.43
1960 Monthly Average	9.43	9.40	9.39	8.97	8.96	11.63
1961 Monthly Average	9.40	9.25	9.23	8.76	8.84	11.77
1961						
December	9.30	9.00	9.00	8.90	8.80	11.62
1962						
January	9.37	9.06	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.62
February	9.50	9.10	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.70
March	9.50	9.20	9.00	9.00	8.80	11.68
April	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.16	9.00	11.64
May	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.03	11.64
June	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.20	11.68
July	9.60	9.20	9.10	9.20	9.20	11.72
August	9.62	9.12	8.94	9.20	9.20	11.72
September	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	11.76
October	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	11.76
November	9.70	9.20	9.00	9.20	9.20	
Last 12-Month Average	9.57	9.15	9.03	9.12	9.04	11.69 ^{5/}

1/ Spot prices during 1956-60 were for sugar in bags under Contract No. 6 plus .50 cents per pound duty (Cuban). Beginning with 1961, spot prices are for bulk sugar under Contract No. 7, the terms of which are duty paid or duty free.

2/ Spot prices during 1956-60 based on No. 4 Contract which was for bagged sugar F.A.S. Cuba. Beginning with 1961 spot prices are those under No. 8 Contract which is also for bagged sugar but F.O.B. and stowed at Greater Caribbean ports (including Brazil).

3/ For 1956-60 these amounts are the difference between the spot prices of the No. 6 "Domestic" Contract rolled back to Cuba (minus freight and insurance) and the spot prices of the No. 4 "World" Contract. Beginning with 1961 the No. 7 "Domestic Bulk" Contract has been adjusted by deducting duty (.625¢) computed freight, insurance and unloading charges, and adding the bag allowance (currently .04¢) before calculating the differential from No. 8 "World" Contract spot prices.

4/ These are basis prices in 100 pound paper bags, NOT delivered prices. To obtain delivered prices add "Freight Prepay" and deduct discounts and allowances. For illustration see Sugar Reports 81, January 1959, pages 5 to 9.

5/ 11-Month Average.

Table 24. - Refined sugar production and month-end stocks

Year and Month	Production		Month-end Stocks ^{1/}	
	Cane sugar refiners	Beet Processors	Cane sugar refiners	Beet Processors
1,000 short tons, raw value				
1957-61 monthly average	529	189	297	861
1960 monthly average	542	203	312	915
1961 monthly average	553	198	292	932
<u>1961</u>				
December	514	474	245	1,269
<u>1962</u>				
January	519	247	296	1,377
February	447	54	302	1,298
March	561	14	244	1,119
April	511	75	267	1,006
May	616	47	280	863
June	692	47	276	687
July	656	47	284	521
August	720	71	238	321
September	591	122	255	186
October	588	584	236	571
November ^{2/}	610	670	271	1,057
Last 12-month average	585	204	266	856

^{1/} Includes over-quota and quota exempt sugar.^{2/} Preliminary.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service
Washington 25, D.C.

POSTAGE AND FEES PAID
U. S. Department of
Agriculture

OFFICIAL BUSINESS